

The LeFrak Forum's theme is political philosophy and public policy. The word "philosophy" often signifies airy abstraction unconnected with the real world. But at the LeFrak Forum, the idea is that much of what people think about practical affairs is determined ultimately by deeply embedded and barely conscious beliefs about what is good and bad, just and unjust. The LeFrak Forum will approach pressing and concrete issues by exposing the underlying and philosophical foundations of conflict. The Forum will always remind us that these foundations are not just derived out of nowhere, even though most people—and increasingly more scholars and students—don't know where they come from. We get them—and hence the very terms of our debates and differences—from the historical tradition of Western thought. The Forum will not insist on agreement. Rather, it will strive to expose the real grounds upon which we disagree about such practical matters as how big government should be, whether a person is first an individual or a member of a group, and whether America should mind its own business or police the world.

The Forum pursues its mission by sponsoring an array of activities: lecture series and international conferences, research and publication, post-doctoral research fellowships, and enriched graduate and undergraduate education. The aim is to enliven, deepen, and diversify debate on campus and to provide fresh views on public policy to those who lead in politics and society and to those who form or influence public opinion. But most important, the LeFrak Forum ensures that at Michigan State the Western tradition will always be studied and that free-market points of view toward the solutions to social problems will always get a fair hearing. But what about this "always"? It is one thing to help scholars or a curriculum one knows. In fact, it's important to know the people involved so the gift gets used for the purpose you intend. But it's quite another thing to have confidence that the program one endows will continue long after the people one knows are gone. This has to be a serious concern for any donor who gives a permanent endowment to a program or particular curriculum. Buildings and endowed chairs are pretty stable. But programs can easily change over time and even become the opposite of what they were at the outset. Solving this problem was very important to us. The solution was unique and, we hope, a model for what others can and should do. The terms of the endowment agreement were tailored to ensure that the purposes and spirit of the LeFrak Forum would always be maintained. There were two crucial issues.

First, it was important to spell out the meaning of the LeFrak Forum's goals in concrete detail. To this end the agreement stipulates that free-market points of view must always get a fair hearing in LeFrak Forum activities. The agreement says that the Forum must always provide a venue for arguments in favor of "liberty and free enterprise capitalism and the study of the Western philosophic and intellectual tradition, especially as it establishes the moral and conceptual basis for constitutional democracy, limited government, the American Founding, individualism, freedom of expression and economic enterprise, and entrepreneurial and market based approaches to national and global political and social problems." And lest there be any uncertainty

about what the "Western tradition" really is, the agreement actually lists the specific authors on whose works LeFrak Forum teaching and research must focus. They are: "such thinkers as Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Machiavelli, Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Hume, Kant, Adam Smith, Burke, the American Founders (Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Jay, Adams), de Tocqueville, Hegel, Mill, Nietzsche, Weber, Heidegger, and Strauss." This list is of course not exhaustive; but no one could mistake who must always matter the most at the LeFrak Forum.

Second, it was essential to assure full academic freedom and autonomy as those values are understood by the relevant university officials. Donors to programs must understand this concern. It does no good to exert positive influence on the university curriculum by threatening academic freedom. Such attempts will not and should not succeed. Furthermore, it does no good to one's own cause to set up programs in which the converted speak only to their respective choirs. That's the very problem on campus these days: not enough real intellectual diversity, not enough respect for all points of view, too much lemming-like adherence to fads. The agreement therefore specifies explicitly that "all points of view can and will be presented at the LeFrak Forum." Critics of the Western tradition and capitalism will have their say. They just won't go unchallenged. And finally, it should be noted that while the agreement provides for our advice, it makes absolutely clear that appointment and review of LeFrak Forum personnel is determined by appropriate academic officers of the University. Donors must never try to appoint professors to their programs. That would violate institutional autonomy.

Ethel and I are proud of the Forum, which is now in business and off to a wonderful start. We're sure that it will prosper and grow, make a real contribution to education at Michigan State, and be a significant voice in national and international policy debates. We hope that other philanthropists will follow our lead and the model of the LeFrak Forum. We hope they will endow programs that support education in our precious Western tradition.

HONORING MONSIGNOR HENRY J. DZIADOSZ

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I come to the Senate floor to pay tribute to a man of uncommon character and faith, whom I am fortunate to call a friend: Monsignor Henry J. Dziadosz. For almost three decades, Monsignor Dziadosz has served as the Pastor at St. Bridget's of Kildare Church in Moodus, Connecticut, of which I am a member. And for half a century, he has inspired countless people through his works as a Catholic Priest in Connecticut. After his many years of service and guidance, Monsignor Dziadosz is retiring, and I wish to offer my praise for the Monsignor on this special occasion.

Monsignor Dziadosz is a spiritual father for the parishioners of St. Bridget's, and he has overseen the transformation of the church—both physically and spiritually.

On Easter Sunday, 1971, two years after being named the Pastor, he announced the proposed restoration and renovation of the congregation's original church: Old St. Bridget's on North Moodus Road. The church had been the home of Catholic worshippers from 1867 to 1958, and Monsignor believed that its preservation would serve as a monument to the perseverance of its parishioners. With the help of many volunteers, the old church was dedicated on Memorial Day 1971, and the renovation was known as the "Miracle of Moodus."

He also oversaw the construction of an outdoor pavilion at the church in 1976. And in a show of the Monsignor's dedication to the improvement of religious education, the church opened its Religious Education Center in 1983.

But the true impact that Monsignor Dziadosz had on St. Bridget's parish is not measured in mortar and brick, it is measured in the spirit of the congregation.

Monsignor has always said that one of his goals at the church was to create a spirit of community where no member of the parish would ever feel alone, either in times of despair or happiness. He knows that we all face challenges in our life, and when we support one another we can work through our difficulties and overcome them. Through his hard work and dedication, he was able to create such a spirit of togetherness at St. Bridget's, and for that, I and many others are thankful.

He brought an energetic approach to the church, and he was not afraid to challenge convention in order to do what he felt was best for the congregation. He always taught the virtues of tolerance and worked to break down barriers and bring people together. He also challenged people to ask more from themselves and to show more concern and compassion for those persons in the community and the world who are less fortunate.

He also felt that St. Bridget's should not only serve the parish, but the community at large. He opened the doors of the church for members of local Protestant delegations to hold their worship services. He also allowed senior groups and other organizations to use church facilities. He even had a generator installed on the church premises so that the church may serve as a haven in case of emergencies or natural disasters. In addition, he singlehandedly raised \$50,000 for the construction of a chapel and convent for the cloistered Carmelite sisters of Roxas City, the Philippines, proving that his compassion and concern for others extends far beyond any physical borders.

On the occasion of his retirement, I think it is appropriate to look back at

some of the words that Monsignor Dziadosz spoke at the time that the parish celebrated his 25th year at St. Bridget's. He said, "We can never say we've done it, we've reached our goal."

In certain respects he's right, because life is an ongoing process, and our goals are constantly changing. But, in the end, I think that anyone who knows Monsignor Dziadosz would say that he's wrong. Monsignor Dziadosz not only reached his goals, he exceeded them.

His retirement is a time of great loss for the parish, but more important, it is a time for celebration. His words and actions have been a source of inspiration and strength for countless individuals through the years, and his guidance will be dearly missed. On behalf of the people of St. Bridget's and the people of Connecticut, I say thank you Monsignor, and may God bless you.●

TRIBUTE TO KIRK O'DONNELL

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this morning I joined Senator KENNEDY and hundreds of mourners from Massachusetts and around the country, to pay our last respects to our friend Kirk O'Donnell and to offer our sincere condolences to Kirk's wife, Kathy, and their two children, Holly and Brendan. For all of us who knew and admired Kirk, this was a difficult morning at the Holy Name Church in West Roxbury, difficult to say goodbye to a special friend who left us too soon. But Mr. President, I believe everyone in attendance this morning at the funeral services took some comfort in the way that friends and family alike—and Kirk had both many friends and a tight-knit family—came together to share our personal recollections of Kirk. It was striking to see just how deeply everyone respected Kirk O'Donnell, the many ways in which he touched so many lives.

Kirk O'Donnell made a deep impact on those who knew him, certainly, but he also made a difference for millions of people in this country who never met him, but whose lives are better because of his life of committed service. Three articles in today's newspapers, one by Al Hunt of the Wall Street Journal, another by Tom Oliphant of the Boston Globe and yet another by Susan Estrich of the Boston Herald, stood out in my mind as testimony to the legacy Kirk O'Donnell left behind in this country. Al Hunt, Tom Oliphant, and Susan Estrich knew Kirk O'Donnell as a friend and they performed a great service in capturing Kirk's essence, the depth of a man who never stopped fighting for those causes in which he believed. I know that, as we all say goodbye to Kirk O'Donnell this week, those articles provide both comfort for those who knew Kirk, and inspiration for those who, even in these troubled political times in the United States, still believe in the dignity of public service.

Mr. President, I would ask that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 10, 1998]

THE LOSS OF A TALENTED, DECENT AND HONORABLE MAN

(By Albert R. Hunt)

Kirk O'Donnell, one of the ablest and most honorable people in American politics, died suddenly last weekend at the altogether too young age of 52. Even in grieving, it's somehow hard not to think how different the Clinton presidency might have been if Kirk O'Donnell had been a top White House adviser starting in 1993.

He combined the best virtues of the old and the new politics. Raised in the rough-and-tumble environs of Boston tribal warfare, he never saw politics as anything but a contact sport. But he always practiced it with decency and civility.

He was a great student of political history, which better enabled him to appreciate contemporary changes. There was a pragmatism to Kirk O'Donnell that never conflicted with his commitment and total integrity.

Success never changed him. He founded the influential Center for National Policy (his successor as its chair was Madeleine Albright) and then became a partner in the high-powered law firm of Vernon Jordan and Bob Strauss. But his values and devotion to family, friends and country were remarkably constant.

"He was a big oak tree of a friend," notes Stanley Brand, a Washington lawyer, of the former Brown University football star, a description which Mr. O'Donnell used to joke, was an "oxymoron."

He cut his political teeth working for Mayor Kevin White in Boston in the mid-70s, running the neighborhood city halls, developing an appreciation of the relationships between common folks and government that would serve him well for the next quarter century. Then there were more than seven years as chief counsel to House Speaker Tip O'Neill.

There was an exceptional triumvirate of top aides to the speaker: Leo Diehl, his longtime colleague who was the link to the past and the gatekeeper who kept away the hangers-on; Ari Weiss, although only in his twenties, unrivaled as a policy expert; and Kirk O'Donnell, in his early thirties, who brought political, legal and foreign policy expertise to the table, always with superb judgment.

Through it may seem strange in today's Congress, he commanded real respect across the aisle. "Kirk was really a tough, bright opponent; he was a great strategist because he didn't let his emotions cloud his judgment," recalls Billy Pitts, who was Mr. O'Donnell's Republican counterpart working with GOP House Leader Bob Michel. "But he always was a delight to be around and his word was gold."

When the Democrats were down, routed by the Reagan revolution in 1981, it was Kirk O'Donnell who put together a strategy memorandum advising the party to lay off esoteric issues and not to refight the tax issues but to focus on social security and jobs. It was the blueprint for a big Democratic comeback the next year. When then Republican Congressman Dick Cheney criticized the speaker for tough partisanship, Mr. O'Donnell immediately turned it around by citing a book that Rep. Cheney and his wife had written on House leaders that praised the same qualities that he now was criticizing.

For operated as well at that intersection of substance and politics, or understood both as well. He played a major role in orchestrating a powerful contingent of Irish-American politicians, including the speaker, to oppose

pro-Irish groups espousing violence. "Kirk put the whole Irish thing together," the speaker said.

He was staunchly liberal on the responsibility of government to care for those in need or equal rights. But he cringed when Democrats veered off onto fringe issues, and never forgot the lessons learned running neighborhood city halls in his 20's. Family values to Kirk O'Donnell wasn't a political buzzword or cliché, but a reality of life; there never has been a more loving family than Kirk and Kathy O'Donnell and their kids, Holly and Brendan.

The Clinton administration made job overtures to Kirk O'Donnell several times but they were never commensurate with his talents. He should have been either Chief of Staff or legal counsel from the very start of this administration. He would have brought experience, expertise, maturity, judgment, toughness—intimate knowledge of the way Washington works—that nobody else in that White House possessed.

But sadly, that's not what this president sought. For Kirk O'Donnell wouldn't have tolerated dissembling. He never was unfaithful to those he worked for but "spinning"—as in situational truths—was foreign to him. When working for the speaker of Michael Dukakis in 1988, he would dodge, bob, sometimes talk gibberish but never, in hundreds of interviews with me, did he ever dissemble.

The contrast between this and someone like Dick Morris, who Mr. Clinton continuously turned to, is striking. This was brought home anew when Mr. Morris, the former top Clinton aide, wrote a letter seeming to take issue with a column I wrote a few weeks ago.

For starters, he erroneously denied that he suggested Hillary Clinton is a lesbian. More substantively, Mr. Morris says that Mr. Clinton called him when the Lewinsky story broke and had him do a poll to gauge reaction. He did that and told Mr. Clinton the public wouldn't accept the truth. Although Mr. Morris turned over what he says is that poll to Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr, some of us question whether the survey was genuine.

The infamous political consultant swears he sampled 500 people, asked 25 to 30 questions and did it all out of own pocket for \$2,000. If true, it was a slipshod survey upon which the president reportedly decided to stake his word. (Only days later, Mr. Clinton swore at a private White House meeting that he hadn't spoken to Mr. Morris in ages.)

There was no more an astute analyst of polls than Kirk O'Donnell. He would pepper political conversations with survey data. But because he understood history and had such personal honor he always understood a poll was a snapshot, often valuable. But it never could be a substitute for principle or morality or integrity.

There were currencies of his professional and personal life. These no longer are commonplace commodities in politics, which is one of many reasons that the passing of this very good man is such a loss.

[From the Boston Globe, Sept. 10, 1998]

HE STOOD FOR POLITICS AT ITS BEST

(By Thomas Oliphant)

He was arguably the best mayor Boston never had, among a handful of people who mattered most to the turbulent city of the 1970's.

No one did more for the House of Representatives over the last generation who was never elected to it, no history of national affairs in the 1980s is complete without his large thumbprint.

The last four presidents have known all about his special gifts and felt their impact;